

**REMARKS**

Applicants acknowledge that the outstanding Office Action has been made final, as indicated at item 2(a) of the Office Action Summary, and at page 18 of the text. Nevertheless, Applicants note that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of Claims 1-6 and 11-13 based on Claim 8 of co-pending application Serial No. 10/192,317 in view of various teaching references has been entered for the first time in the present application, and Applicants have not previously had an opportunity to respond to this ground of rejection. In particular, as noted in the remarks which accompanied the response submitted June 9, 2004, the above-mentioned claims of the present application were previously rejected over Claim 1 of co-pending application Serial No. 10/192,317. However, as further pointed out in the response, there is no Claim 1 in the latter co-pending application.

Because Applicants have not previously had an opportunity to respond to the rejection of the present application over Claim 8 of co-pending application Serial No. 10/192,317, Applicants respectfully submit that the August 25, 2004 Office Action should not have been made final. Accordingly, it is requested that the finality of that Office Action be withdrawn.

In response to the obviousness-type double patenting rejections based on Claim 8 of co-pending application Serial No. 10/192,317 as set forth in paragraphs 4 through 8 of the Office Action, Applicants have submitted concurrently herewith a Terminal Disclaimer with regard to that application. As noted in paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the timely submission of such a Terminal Disclaimer overcomes such a rejection based on non-statutory double patenting grounds. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 11-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Walker et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,434,529) in view of Uppaluru (U.S. Patent No. 5,915,001) while Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 have been rejected as unpatentable over Walker et al in view of Uppaluru, and further in view of Gould et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,799,279). In addition, Claim 3 has been rejected over the latter three patents, and further in view of Cherveney et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,401,068); and Claim 5 has been rejected over the same three patents and further in view of Basore et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,752,232). However, for the reasons set forth hereinafter, Applicants respectfully submit that each of Claims 1-6 and 11-13, which remain pending in this application, distinguishes over the cited references, whether considered separately or in combination.

The present invention is directed to a speech actuated input system for providing access from a mobile terminal device (such as a portable phone, a PDA, or PC) to a computer network. For example, as illustrated in Figure 1 of the application, the present invention provides speech activated access between mobile terminal devices 10A-10C via a radio base station and a global communications network (40) to a plurality of applications service providers. For this purpose, a speech portal server 50 is provided, which receives input speech, applies a command conversion to the content of the speech in order to convert it into a command and an object to be searched for, and transmits the latter to an ASP 60, corresponding to the content of the command as deciphered in the speech portal server. The ASP 60, in turn, searches a corresponding database, and provides the speech input terminal where the speech is entered with a search result to the speech portal terminal 50. (See specification page 11, paragraphs [0026] and [0027].)

As noted in paragraph [0028], the speech input system according to the invention is used primarily for portable terminals, in an environment where a keyboard may be unavailable or inconvenient. It is also applicable, however, to stationary terminals (such as 30A-30C in Figure 1) where keyboard operation is not preferred.

According to a feature of the invention, the speech input system includes a "speech input terminal", which includes a means for displaying an access status regarding access to an external system, as well as a search result derived from the external system.

Referring first to the rejection of Claim 1 based on Walker et al, the Office Action (page 12) states that Walker et al includes a computer with a display, and refers in particular to Column 18, line 30 through Column 19, line 42 as disclosing that the display displays the access status to an external system and a search result. In particular, the Office Action at page 12 appears to equate the result states as corresponding to the access states according to Claim 1. In this regard, the Office Action refers to Column 17 at lines 25-49, which refer to "RESULT\_ACCEPTED" and "RESULT\_REJECTED" events. However, Walker et al fails to teach or suggest anything regarding display of a result of the speech recognition, or relating to the access status for connection to the external system and displaying the search result. The alternative event "RESULT\_ACCEPTED" and "RESULT\_REJECTED" clearly are not analogous.

Furthermore, according to the present invention as defined in Claim 1, the application service provider is provided with an information search means which searches the information, based on the command text and the object text received from the speech portal server, and provides the speech portal server

with a search result, as described at paragraph [0027]. In Walker et al, however, there is no disclosure which suggests separating the command text and the object text as recited in Claim 1, or to recognizing or calculating based thereon, through a network such as the application service provider or the speech portal server, as the computer.

In addition, as also recited in Claim 1, a "conversation control means" has access to and receives a service from the application service provider, which provides differing information based on the separated command text and object text, and provides the service to the speech input terminal. In this regard, the Office Action refers to Column 18, lines 23-28 of Walker et al as suggesting that the application service provider provides the speech input terminal with a service. However, the result in Walker et al is that of speech recognition, and differs fundamentally from the service in the present invention. That is, the service in the present invention, as is clear from the context of Claim 1, is that provided by the application services provider, such as, for example, the navigation information application service provider or the music input information application service as defined in Claims 3 and 4. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the invention defined in Claim 1 is not obvious in view of Walker et al.

With regard to Claim 11, a "speech portal server" refers to a server computer, provided as a gateway used for receiving a service by a terminal in the same way as the "portal server" in the field of the web. This is a different computer than the terminal, and is connected to a network, etc. Furthermore, as defined in Claim 11, the phrase "an application service provider" refers in the same way as in a field of a web, and is positioned at the backend of the "portal server" as a computer for performing services to the respective application. In this manner, the object of the present invention is to access performance of the services using a voice (speech) input system, with the computer being dispersed on the Internet.

The Office Action states that the element 428 shown in Figure 1 of Walker et al corresponds to a "speech portal server" or an "application service provider". However, the latter are "memory" or an "application program" entered in one computer, and differ fundamentally from the "speech portal server" or "application services provider" of the present invention.

In addition, the Office Action states that Uppaluru at Column 6, lines 47-51, discloses a web browser. However, the system shown in Uppaluru is a voice web browser, for performing an interface only via voice communication. It has no function to display communicated information. In Uppaluru, the voice web

browser 106 is mounted on the voice web gateway 105, and the subscriber accesses it by voice communication via a telephone.

The "web browser" in the present invention is a "web browser" as such, and by itself does not have a function as a voice interface. Rather, it has a function as a display, instead, and is mounted on a speech input terminal. In the present invention, the information transmitted from the "speech portal server" or "application service provider" can be displayed by using the conventional web browser on the terminal, which does not have a speech recognition function. Thus, the present invention differs fundamentally from the cited references.

In light of the foregoing remarks, this application should be in condition for allowance, and early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested. If there are any questions regarding this response or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and

Serial No. 10/083,636  
Response Dated: November 24, 2004:  
Reply to Office Action Mailed: 8/25/04  
Attorney Docket No. 381NP/50948

please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit  
Account No. 05-1323 (Docket # 381NP/50948).

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Gary R. Edwards". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Gary R. Edwards  
Registration No. 31,824

CROWELL & MORING, LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
GRE:kms